arXiv:1207.0859v1 [math.PR] 4 Jul 2012

L^2-THEORY FOR NON-SYMMETRIC ORNSTEIN-UHLENBECK SEMIGROUPS ON DOMAINS

JOYCE ASSAAD AND JAN VAN NEERVEN

Abstract. We present some new results on analytic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups and use them to extend recent work of Da Prato and Lunardi for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups on domains to the non-symmetric case. In particular we obtain sufficient conditions in order that the domain $\mathsf{D}(\sqrt{-L})$ be a first order Sobolev space, and $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathscr{O}})$ be contained in the corresponding second order Gaussian Sobolev space.

1. Introduction

In this paper we present new results on analytic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups associated with the linear Cauchy problem

$$dX(t) = AX(t)\,dt + dW(t),$$

where A is the generator of a C_0-semigroup on a Banach space E and W is a cylindrical Brownian motion, and use them to extend recent work of Da Prato and Lunardi [9] for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups on domains (see also [8]) to the non-symmetric case. The approach in [9] is based on the Feynman-Kac formula and uses the pathwise continuity of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process in a crucial way. Our first main result (Theorem 2.5) asserts that in the non-symmetric case, pathwise continuity still holds provided the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup is analytic on $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. Here μ_∞ denotes an invariant measure whose existence we assume throughout. Further new results concern the μ_∞-almost sure pointwise convergence of analytic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups to the projection onto the constant functions in $L^p(E,\mu_\infty)$ (Theorem 2.7) and a Poincaré inequality for analytic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups (Theorem 2.8).

The construction and discussion of the main properties of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup $(P_{\mathscr{O}}(t))_{t\geqslant 0}$ and its generator $L_{\mathscr{O}}$ on an open domain $\mathscr{O}$ in E, presented in Sections 3 and 4, are extensions of their symmetric counterparts in [9]; see also [8, 25] for earlier work. In contrast, the domain identification of $\mathsf{D}(\sqrt{-L_{\mathscr{O}}})$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ as a first order Gaussian Sobolev space is essentially trivial in the symmetric case but requires substantial effort in the non-symmetric case. In order to establish this identification, in Section 5 we adapt arguments from recent work by Maas and the second named author [20, 21]. Along the same lines we prove that $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathscr{O}})$ is contained in the corresponding second order Gaussian Sobolev space, thus extending the maximal regularity result of [10] (where the special case $A = -\frac{1}{2}I$ is considered). As an application we prove a Poincaré inequality for the gradient on $\mathscr{O}$ in the direction of H.

All spaces are real. Terminology is standard and follows [17, 19, 20, 21, 23].

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35R15 Secondary: 35J25, 42B25, 46E35, 47D05, 60H07.

Key words and phrases. Analytic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups, Riesz transforms on domains, domain identification, Poincaré inequality, H^∞-functional calculus.

The second named author is supported by VICI subsidy 639.033.604 of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

Acknowledgement: This work was started during a three month visit of the first named author at Delft University of Technology. She would like to thank the department for its kind hospitality.

2. Analytic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups

Let E be a real Banach space, H a real Hilbert space with inner product $[\cdot,\cdot]$, W^H an H-cylindrical Brownian motion, and $i : H \to E$ a bounded injective linear operator. Let $S = (S(t))_{t\geqslant 0}$ be a C_0-semigroup of bounded linear operators, with generator A, on E. Throughout this paper we shall make the following standing assumption.

Assumption 2.1. *The linear stochastic Cauchy problem*

$$dX(t) = AX(t)\,dt + dW^H(t), \quad t \geqslant 0, \tag{2.1}$$

admits an invariant measure.

Note that in (2.1) we suppress the inclusion mapping i and identify H with a linear subspace of E.

As is well-known (see [11, 17]), this assumption is satisfied if and only if there exists a centred Gaussian Radon measure μ_∞ on E whose reproducing kernel Hilbert space $i_\infty : H_\infty \hookrightarrow E$ satisfies

$$\|i_\infty^* x^*\|_{H_\infty}^2 = \int_0^\infty \|i^* S^*(t) x^*\|_H^2\,dt, \quad x^* \in E^*.$$

Here, we identify H and H_∞ with their respective duals using the Riesz representation theorem. The measure μ_∞ is then invariant (which, by definition, means that (2.4) below is satisfied).

On the space $B_{\rm b}(E)$ of bounded Borel functions $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ we define the operators $P(t)$, $t \geqslant 0$, by

$$P(t)f(x) := \mathbb{E} f(X^x(t)), \quad t \geqslant 0, \quad x \in E, \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$X^x(t) := S(t)x + \int_0^t S(t-s)\,dW^H(s) \tag{2.3}$$

is the mild solution of the problem (2.1) with initial value x; the existence and uniqueness of this solution is implicit in the Assumption 2.1. These operators satisfy $P(0) = I$ and $P(t+s) = P(t)P(s)$ for all t and $s \geqslant 0$. For all $1 \leqslant p < \infty$ the family $P = (P(t))_{t\geqslant 0}$ extends to a C_0-contraction semigroup on $L^p(E, \mu_\infty)$ satisfying

$$\int_E P(t)f\,d\mu_\infty = \int_E f\,d\mu_\infty, \quad f \in L^p(E,\mu_\infty),\ t \geqslant 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Throughout this paper we make the following assumption.

Assumption 2.2. *The semigroup P is analytic on $L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$.*

In statements like these, we always tacitly pass to the complexifications of the operators and the spaces involved. Thus, what we are assuming is that $P_{\mathbb{C}}$ is analytic on $L^2(E, \mu_\infty; \mathbb{C})$. This assumption implies (see [19]) that $P_{\mathbb{C}}$ is in fact an analytic contraction semigroup on $L^p(E, \mu_\infty; \mathbb{C})$ for all $1 < p < \infty$.

We proceed with a discussion of some consequences of Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 that will be needed later on.

Let $U : H_\infty \to H$ be the linear operator with initial domain $i_\infty^*(E^*)$, defined by

$$U i_\infty^* x^* := i^* x^*, \quad x^* \in E^*.$$

This operator is densely defined, and, by [16, Theorem 3.5], the analyticity of P on $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ implies that U is closable. From now on we denote by U its closure and by $\mathsf{D}(U)$ the domain of this closure.

Let $\phi : H_\infty \to L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ be the isometric embedding given by

$$(\phi(i_\infty^* x^*))(\cdot) := \langle \,\cdot\,, x^*\rangle, \quad x^* \in E^*.$$

In order to simplify notations a bit, we shall write

$$\phi_h(x) := (\phi(h))(x).$$

When H_0 is a linear subspace of H_∞ and $k \geqslant 0$ is an integer, we denote by $\mathcal{F}C_{\mathrm{b}}^k(E,H_0)$ the vector space of all μ_∞-almost everywhere defined functions $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$f := \varphi(\phi_{h_1},\cdots,\phi_{h_n}), \quad x \in E,$$

with $n \geqslant 1, \varphi \in C_{\mathrm{b}}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $h_1,\cdots,h_n \in H_0$. Here $C_{\mathrm{b}}^k(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the space of all bounded continuous functions with bounded continuous derivatives up to order k. For $f \in \mathcal{F}C_{\mathrm{b}}^1(E,\mathsf{D}(U))$ we define the Fréchet derivative $D^H f : E \to H$ of f in the direction of H by

$$D^H f := \sum_{j=1}^n \partial_j \varphi(\phi_{h_1},\cdots,\phi_{h_n}) \otimes U h_j.$$

The closability of U implies that D^H is closable from $L^p(E,\mu_\infty)$ to $L^p(E,\mu_\infty;H)$ for all $p \in [1,\infty)$ (see [16, Theorem 3.5] and [17, Proposition 8.7]). Henceforth, by slight abuse of notation we denote by D^H its closure in $L^p(E,\mu_\infty)$ and write

$$W_H^{1,p}(E,\mu_\infty) := \mathsf{D}_p(D^H)$$

for the domain of this closure in $L^p(E,\mu_\infty)$. Furthermore we write

$$\mathsf{D}(D^H) := \mathsf{D}_2(D^H).$$

Under Assumption (2.1), S maps H_∞ into itself, and the restriction $S_\infty = S|_{H_\infty}$ is a C_0-contraction semigroup on H_∞. We shall denote its generator by A_∞. The next result is taken from [17] and [19].

Proposition 2.3. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. There exists a unique bounded operator $B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ such that*

$$iBi^*x^* = -i_\infty A_\infty^* i_\infty^* x^*, \quad x^* \in \mathsf{D}(A^*).$$

This operator satisfies $B + B^* = I$ and $[Bh,h] = \frac{1}{2}\|h\|_H^2$ for all $h \in H$.

Let l be the sesquilinear form defined by

$$l(f,g) := [BD^H f, D^H g] \quad f,g \in \mathsf{D}(l) := \mathsf{D}(D^H), \tag{2.5}$$

where $B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is the bounded operator described in Proposition 2.3. This form is closed, densely defined, accretive and sectorial on $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. Let us denote by $D^{H*}BD^H$ the associated sectorial operator with domain consisting of all functions $f \in \mathsf{D}(D^H)$ such that $BD^H f \in \mathsf{D}(D^{H*})$. This domain is a core for $\mathsf{D}(D^H)$ (see [24, Lemma 1.25]) and we have (see [19]):

Proposition 2.4. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. The generator L of the semigroup P on $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ equals*

$$L = -D^{H*}BD^H.$$

Below we shall also need the following result.

Theorem 2.5. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. Then the mild solution X of the problem* (2.1) *admits a continuous modification.*

Proof. On a possibly larger probability space, let Y_∞ be a centred E-valued Gaussian random variable, independent of W^H, with distribution μ_∞. Then the process $Z = (Z(t))_{t\geqslant 0}$ defined by $Z(t) = S(t)Y_\infty + X^0(t)$ is stationary. It is clear that the process X has a continuous modification if and only if this is true for Z.

For $t \geqslant s \geqslant 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\langle Z(t), x^*\rangle\langle Z(s), x^*\rangle &= \mathbb{E}\langle Z(0), x^*\rangle\langle Z(t-s), x^*\rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}\langle Y_\infty, x^*\rangle\langle S(t-s)Y_\infty + X^0(t-s), x^*\rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}\langle Y_\infty, x^*\rangle\langle S(t-s)Y_\infty, x^*\rangle \\ &= \langle Q_\infty S^*(t-s)x^*, x^*\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where we used that Y_∞ and $X^0(t)$ are independent for every $t \geqslant 0$.

For $t \geqslant s \geqslant 0$, by the above we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 \leqslant \mathbb{E}\langle Z(t) - Z(s), x^*\rangle^2 &= \mathbb{E}\langle Z(t), x^*\rangle^2 + \mathbb{E}\langle Z(s), x^*\rangle^2 - 2\mathbb{E}\langle Z(t), x^*\rangle\langle Z(s), x^*\rangle \\ &= 2\langle Q_\infty x^*, x^*\rangle - 2\langle Q_\infty x^*, S^*(t-s)x^*\rangle \\ &= 2\langle Q_\infty(I - S^*(t-s))x^*, x^*\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

The authors would like to thank Ben Gołdys for showing this argument.

Since μ_∞ is a Radon measure, the closure E_0 of its reproducing kernel Hilbert space H_∞ in E is separable, and we have $\mu_\infty(E_0) = 1$. The invariance of H_∞ under S (see [5, 22]) implies that also E_0 is invariant under S. The covariance operator Q_t of μ_t satisfies

$$\langle Q_t x^*, x^*\rangle = \int_0^t \|i^* S^*(s)x^*\|_H^2\, ds \leqslant \langle Q_\infty x^*, x^*\rangle, \quad x^* \in E^*,$$

and therefore Anderson's inequality implies that $\mu_t(E_0) = 1$ for all $t \geqslant 0$. It follows that for all $t \geqslant 0$, $X_t \in E_0$ almost surely. Since H is contained in E_0 (by [17, Proposition 2.6]), this argument shows that without loss of generality we may assume that E is separable.

The analyticity of P on $L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$ implies that the operator $Q_\infty A^* x^*$, which is well defined on the domain $\mathsf{D}(A^*)$, extends to a bounded operator from E^* to E. In fact, we have

$$\|Q_\infty A^* x^*\| \leqslant \|i\|\|Q_\infty A^* x^*\|_H \leqslant \|i\|\|B\|\|i^* x^*\|_H \leqslant \|i\|^2\|B\|\|x^*\|.$$

By a standard argument, this implies that for all $x^* \in E^*$,

$$\mathbb{E}\langle Z(t) - Z(s), x^*\rangle^2 = 2\langle Q_\infty(I - S^*(t-s))x^*, x^*\rangle \leqslant M_T|t-s|\|i\|^2\|B\|\|x^*\|^2, \tag{2.6}$$

where $M_T = \sup_{0\leqslant t\leqslant T}\|S(t)\|$. The process $\langle Z, x^*\rangle$ being Gaussian, the Kolmogorov continuity criterion then implies that the process $\langle Z, x^*\rangle$ has a continuous modification. By (2.6) and the stationarity of Z, the conditions of [4, Proposition 1] are satisfied and we conclude that the Gaussian process $(\langle Z(t), x^*\rangle)_{(t,x^*)\in[0,T]\times B_{E^*}}$ has a continuous modification. The existence of a continuous modification of $(Z(t))_{t\in[0,T]}$ then follows from [15, Theorem 1.2]. □

In the rest of this paper, we will always work with a continuous version of X whose existence is guaranteed by the previous theorem.

We continue with two almost everywhere convergence results. The first concerns the behaviour of $P(t)$ as $t \downarrow 0$. It follows from the L^p-boundedness of the maximal function

$$Mf(x) := \sup_{t>0}|P(t)f(x)|;$$

see [7] and [20, Proposition 8.5] (where the present setting is considered).

Theorem 2.6. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied and let* $1 < p < \infty$*. For all* $f \in L^p(E, \mu_\infty)$ *we have*

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} P(t)f(x) = f(x) \quad \text{for } \mu_\infty\text{-almost all } x \in E.$$

The second result concerns the behaviour of $P(t)$ as $t \to \infty$. Below we shall only need the part (1) (with $p = 2$) (see also [12, Proposition 10.1.1] for a partial result in this direction).

Theorem 2.7. *Fix* $1 \leqslant p < \infty$*.*

(1) *If Assumption 2.1 is satisfied, then for all* $f \in L^p(E, \mu_\infty)$ *we have*

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} P(t)f = \int_E f \, d\mu_\infty \quad \text{in } L^p(E, \mu_\infty).$$

(2) *If Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 are satisfied, then for all* $f \in L^p(E, \mu_\infty)$ *we have*

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} P(t)f(x) = \int_E f \, d\mu_\infty \quad \text{for } \mu_\infty\text{-almost all } x \in E.$$

Proof. The proof of the first statement follows by second quantisation and using the fact [17, Proposition 2.4] that S_∞^* is strongly stable. The details are as follows.

First we consider the case $p = 2$. For all $h_1, \dots, h_n \in H_\infty$ we have

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} (S_\infty^*(t))^{\otimes n}(h_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes h_n) = \lim_{t \to \infty} S_\infty^*(t)h_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes S_\infty^*(t)h_n = 0,$$

from which it follows that $(S_\infty^*)^{\otimes n} := S_\infty^* \otimes \cdots \otimes S_\infty^*$ (n times) is strongly stable on $H_\infty^{\otimes n} := H_\infty \otimes \cdots \otimes H_\infty$. By restricting to the symmetric tensor products $H_\infty^{\circledS n}$ and taking direct sums, it follows that the second quantised semigroup

$$\Gamma(S_\infty^*) := \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} (S_\infty^{\circledS n})^*$$

is strongly stable on the closed subspace $\bigoplus_{n=1}^\infty H^{\circledS n}$ of $\bigoplus_{n=0}^\infty H^{\circledS n}$. Under the Wiener-Itô isometry, the latter space is mapped isometrically onto $L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$, and the first summand $H^{\circledS 0}$ is mapped onto the one-dimensional subspace spanned by the constant function $\mathbf{1}$. Moreover, under this isometry the semigroup $\bigoplus_{n=0}^\infty (S_\infty^{\circledS n})^*$ corresponds to P [5, 22]. As a result, we find that the semigroup P is strongly stable on $L^2(E, \mu_\infty) \ominus \mathbb{R}\mathbf{1}$. Since $P(t)\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$ and $(\int_E f \, d\mu_\infty)\mathbf{1}$ equals the orthogonal projection of f onto $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{1}$, this gives the first assertion for $p = 2$.

Next let $2 < p < \infty$ be arbitrary, and choose $p < q < \infty$ arbitrarily. Since P is contractive on $L^q(E, \mu_\infty)$, for all $f \in L^q(E, \mu_\infty)$ we have, by convexity,

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\| P(t)f - \int_E f \, d\mu_\infty \Big\|_p &\leqslant \Big\| P(t)f - \int_E f \, d\mu_\infty \Big\|_2^{1-\theta} \Big\| P(t)f - \int_E f \, d\mu_\infty \Big\|_q^{\theta} \\ &\leqslant \Big\| P(t)f - \int_E f \, d\mu_\infty \Big\|_2^{1-\theta} (2\|f\|_q)^\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < \theta < 1$ satisfies $\frac{1-\theta}{2} + \frac{\theta}{q} = \frac{1}{p}$. The right-hand side tends to 0 as $t \to \infty$. Since $L^q(E, \mu_\infty)$ is dense in $L^p(E, \mu_\infty)$ and P is contractive on $L^p(E, \mu_\infty)$, this implies the first assertion for $2 < p < \infty$.

Next let $1 \leqslant p < 2$. For $f \in L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$, the L^2-convergence implies the L^p-convergence by Hölder's inequality. Since $L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$ is dense in $L^p(E, \mu_\infty)$ and P is contractive on $L^p(E, \mu_\infty)$, this gives the first assertion for $1 \leqslant p < 2$.

For the proof of (2) we fix $1 < p < \infty$. We shall identify a dense subspace of functions for which the asserted μ_∞-almost everywhere convergence does hold. By the L^p-boundedness of the maximal function, which follows from the analyticity of

P by [20, Proposition 8.5], the set of all functions for which we have μ_∞-almost everywhere convergence is norm-closed in $L^p(E,\mu_\infty)$ and the proof is complete.

For $h \in H_\infty$ define

$$K_h := \exp\Big(\phi_h - \frac{1}{2}\|h\|^2_{H_\infty}\Big).$$

As is well-known, these functions belong to $L^p(E,\mu_\infty)$ and their linear span is dense in $L^p(E,\mu_\infty)$. Moreover, from the identity

$$K_h = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{1}{n!} I_n(\phi_h^n),$$

with I_n the orthogonal projection in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ onto the n-th Wiener-Itô chaos, it follows that

$$\int_E K_h \, d\mu_\infty = 1.$$

By second quantisation,

$$P(t)K_h = K_{S^*_\infty(t)h}.$$

The proof will be finished by observing that for μ_∞-almost all $x \in E$ we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} P(t)K_h(x) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \exp\Big(\phi_{S^*_\infty(t)h}(x) - \tfrac{1}{2}\|S^*_\infty(t)h\|^2_{H_\infty}\Big) = 1 = \int_E K_h \, d\mu_\infty.$$

In this computation we used that $\lim_{t\to\infty} S^*_\infty(t)h = 0$ in H_∞, from which we shall deduce next that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \phi_{S^*_\infty(t)h} = 0$ μ_∞-almost surely. Once this has been shown the proof is complete.

We start by noting that

$$P(t)\phi_h = \phi_{S^*_\infty(t)h}.$$

Hence by the L^2-boundedness of the maximal function,

$$\big\| \sup_{t>0} |\phi_{S^*_\infty(t)h}| \big\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)} \lesssim \|h\|_{H_\infty}.$$

By the semigroup property, this implies that

$$\big\| \sup_{t>T} |\phi_{S^*_\infty(t)h}| \big\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)} = \big\| \sup_{t>0} |\phi_{S^*_\infty(t+T)h}| \big\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)} \lesssim \|S^*_\infty(T)h\|_{H_\infty}.$$

The right hand side of this expression tends to 0 as $T \to \infty$. Having observed this, the proof can be finished with a standard Borel-Cantelli argument. With Chebyshev's inequality we find times $T_n \to \infty$ such that

$$\mu_\infty\Big(x \in E : \sup_{t>T_n} |\phi_{S^*_\infty(t)h}(x)| > \frac{1}{2^n}\Big) < \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

By the Borel-Cantelli lemma it follows that

$$\mu_\infty\Big(x \in E : \sup_{t>T_n} |\phi_{S^*_\infty(t)h}(x)| > \frac{1}{2^n} \text{ for infinitely many } n\Big) = 0.$$

Hence for μ_∞-almost all $x \in E$ we can find n_0 (depending on x) such that

$$\sup_{t>T_n} |\phi_{S^*_\infty(t)h}(x)| \leqslant \frac{1}{2^n} \quad \text{for all } n \geqslant n_0.$$

Clearly that implies that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \phi_{S^*_\infty(t)h}(x) = 0$ for μ_∞-almost all $x \in E$. □

The next result is an extension of [6, Theorem 3.3, Corollary 3.4], where the stronger assumption was made that $\|S_\infty(t)\| \leqslant e^{-wt}$ for some $w > 0$ and all $t \geqslant 0$.

Theorem 2.8 (Poincaré inequality)**.** *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be satisfied. If the semigroup S_∞ is uniformly exponentially stable, then there is a constant C such that for all $\phi \in W_H^{1,2}(E, \mu_\infty)$ we have*

$$\int_E (\phi - \overline{\phi})^2 \, d\mu_\infty \leqslant C \int_E \|D^H \phi\|^2 \, d\mu_\infty.$$

Proof. By [21], S restricts to a bounded analytic C_0-semigroup $S_H := S|_H$ on H, and by [17, Theorem 5.4] this semigroup is uniformly exponentially stable, say $\|S_H(t)\| \leqslant Me^{-wt}$ with $M \geqslant 1$ and $w > 0$.

Next we note (see [20, Theorem 5.6]) that $P(t)f \in W_H^{1,2}(E, \mu_\infty)$ and $D^H P(t)f = (P(t) \otimes S_H(t))D^H f$. Hence, μ_∞-almost everywhere we have

$$\|D^H P(t)f\|_H^2 = \|P(t) \otimes S_H(t) D^H f\|_H^2 \leqslant M^2 e^{-2wt} P(t)(\|D^H f\|_H^2). \tag{2.7}$$

Combining (2.7) with Proposition 2.4 and Theorem 2.7, as in [9, Proposition 2.2(a)] the desired result follows a method of Deuschel-Stroock [13] (following the lines of the proof of [12, Proposition 10.5.2], using the expression for L as given in [19]; this produces the constant $M^2/2w$). ☐

3. The Feynman-Kac semigroup on $L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$

In this section and the next, we extend the results of [9, Section 3] to the non-symmetric setting. Our proofs follows those of [9] closely, with some modifications necessitated by the non-selfadjointness of L. Another subtle difference concerns the assumptions on the domain $\mathcal{O}$, which we take to be open as in [8, 25]; in [9] closed domains are considered (in this connection see also Remark 4.2). For the convenience of the reader (and for the sake of mathematical rigour) we have therefore decided to write out all proofs in detail.

We shall always assume that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 are satisfied without repeating this at every instance. We fix an nonempty open subset $\mathcal{O}$ in E satisfying

$$\mu_\infty(\mathcal{O}) > 0$$

and a bounded continuous function $V : E \to [0, 1]$ which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} V(x) = 0, & x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}, \\ V(x) > 0, & x \in \complement\overline{\mathcal{O}}. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

For $f \in B_{\rm b}(E)$, $x \in E$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ set

$$P_\varepsilon(t)f(x) := \mathbb{E}\big[f(X^x(t)) e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t V(X^x(r))\,dr}\big]. \tag{3.2}$$

By standard arguments, $P_\varepsilon = (P_\varepsilon(t))_{t \geqslant 0}$ is a semigroup of linear contractions on $B_{\rm b}(E)$, the so-called *Feynman-Kac semigroup* associated with $-L + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V$.

Proposition 3.1 (cf. [9, Proposition 3.1])**.** *For all $f \in B_{\rm b}(E)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\int_E (P_\varepsilon(t)f)^2 \, d\mu_\infty \leqslant \int_E f^2 \, d\mu_\infty.$$

As a consequence, P_ε is uniquely extendable to a C_0-semigroup of contractions on $L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$.

Proof. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for $f \in B_{\rm b}(E)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (P_\varepsilon(t)f(x))^2 &= (\mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t V(X^x(r))\,dr}])^2 \\ &\leqslant \mathbb{E}[f^2(X^x(t))e^{-\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t V(X^x(r))\,dr}] \\ &\leqslant \mathbb{E}[f^2(X^x(t))] = P(t)f^2(x). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating with respect to μ_∞ and using (2.4), we obtain

$$\int_E (P_\varepsilon(t)f)^2\,d\mu_\infty \leqslant \int_E P(t)f^2\,d\mu_\infty = \int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty.$$

This shows that the operators $P_\varepsilon(t)$ are contractive on $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. To see that the resulting semigroup P_ε is strongly continuous, note that for all $f \in C_{\rm b}(E)$ the mapping $t \mapsto P_\varepsilon(t)f(x)$ is continuous for each $x \in E$ by the path continuity of $t \mapsto X^x(t)$. Hence, by dominated convergence, $\lim_{t\downarrow 0} P_\varepsilon(t)f = f$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ for all $f \in C_{\rm b}(E)$. By density and uniform boundedness, the strong continuity of P_ε follows from this. $\square$

From now on, unless stated otherwise, we shall denote by P_ε the C_0-semigroup of contractions on $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ whose existence is assured by the above proposition. Our next aim is to identify $L - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V$ as its generator.

For fixed $\lambda > 0$ and $f \in L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$, let us consider the resolvent equation

$$\lambda\phi_\varepsilon - L\phi_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V\phi_\varepsilon = f. \tag{3.3}$$

Proposition 3.2 (cf. [9, Proposition 3.2]). *The equation (3.3) has a unique solution $\phi_\varepsilon \in \mathsf{D}(L)$ and the following estimates hold:*

$$\int_E \phi_\varepsilon^2\,d\mu_\infty \leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\int_E \|D^H\phi_\varepsilon\|_H^2\,d\mu_\infty \leqslant \frac{2}{\lambda}\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\int_E \phi_\varepsilon^2 V\,d\mu_\infty \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda}\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\int_E \|D^H\phi_\varepsilon\|_H^2 V\,d\mu_\infty \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon^{1/2}}{\lambda^{1/2}}\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. We know that the form l defined in (2.5) is closed, densely defined, sectorial and accretive. Since

$$|[\frac{1}{\varepsilon}Vf, f]_L^2(E,\mu_\infty)| \leqslant \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\|V\|_\infty\|f\|^2_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)},$$

the KLMN theorem (see [18, Theorem VI.1.33]) shows that the form associated to $-L + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V$ is closed, densely defined, and sectorial. It is also accretive since $-L + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V \geqslant -L \geqslant 0$. Therefore, $-L + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V$ is maximal accretive, and (3.3) has a unique solution $\phi_\varepsilon \in \mathsf{D}(L)$. Thus

$$\int_E \phi_\varepsilon^2\,d\mu_\infty = \big\|(\lambda - L + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V)^{-1}f\big\|^2_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)} \leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\|f\|^2_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)} = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty.$$

Let us now multiply both sides of (3.3) by ϕ_ε and integrate over E:

$$\lambda\int_E \phi_\varepsilon^2\,d\mu_\infty - \int_E L\phi_\varepsilon\cdot\phi_\varepsilon\,d\mu_\infty + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_E V\phi_\varepsilon^2\,d\mu_\infty = \int_E f\phi_\varepsilon\,d\mu_\infty. \tag{3.8}$$

Since $[Bu,u] = \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_H^2$,

$$-\int_E L\phi_\varepsilon\cdot\phi_\varepsilon\,d\mu_\infty = \int_E [BD^H\phi_\varepsilon, D^H\phi_\varepsilon]\,d\mu_\infty = \frac{1}{2}\int_E \|D^H\phi_\varepsilon\|_H^2\,d\mu_\infty.$$

Substituting this identity in (3.8) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\int_E \|D^H\phi_\varepsilon\|_H^2\,d\mu_\infty &\leqslant \int_E f\phi_\varepsilon\,d\mu_\infty \\ &\leqslant \Big(\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_E \phi_\varepsilon^2\,d\mu_\infty\Big)^{1/2} \leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty,\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (3.4).

We also notice from (3.8) that

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_E V\phi_\varepsilon^2\,d\mu_\infty \leqslant \int_E f\phi_\varepsilon\,d\mu_\infty \leqslant \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty.$$

Finally, multiplying both sides of (3.3) by $\phi_\varepsilon V$ and integrating gives

$$\lambda\int_E \phi_\varepsilon^2 V\,d\mu_\infty - \int_E L\phi_\varepsilon\cdot\phi_\varepsilon V\,d\mu_\infty + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_E V\phi_\varepsilon^2 V\,d\mu_\infty = \int_E f\phi_\varepsilon V\,d\mu_\infty. \tag{3.9}$$

The same reasoning then gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\int_E \|D^H\phi_\varepsilon\|_H^2 V\,d\mu_\infty &\leqslant \int_E f\phi_\varepsilon V\,d\mu_\infty\\ &\leqslant \Big(\int_E f^2 V\,d\mu_\infty\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_E \phi_\varepsilon^2 V\,d\mu_\infty\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\leqslant \Big(\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_E \phi_\varepsilon^2 V\,d\mu_\infty\Big)^{1/2} \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon^{1/2}}{\lambda^{1/2}}\int_E f^2\,d\mu_\infty.\end{aligned}$$

□

To prove that $L - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V$ is the generator of the semigroup $(P_\varepsilon(t))_{t\geqslant 0}$ we need the following result. Let

$$\mathscr{C} := \operatorname{span}\{P(t)f :\ t > 0,\ f \in C_{\rm b}(E)\}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *$\mathscr{C}$ is a core for $\mathsf{D}(L)$ and we have $\mathscr{C} \subseteq \mathsf{D}(L)\cap C_{\rm b}(E)$.*

Proof. Since $C_{\rm b}(E)$ is dense in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ and contained in $\overline{\mathscr{C}}$, $\mathscr{C}$ is dense in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. Since P is analytic on $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$, $\mathscr{C}$ is contained in $\mathsf{D}(L)$. Moreover $\mathscr{C}$ is P-invariant, and therefore $\mathscr{C}$ is a core for $\mathsf{D}(L)$. Finally, it is immediate from (2.2) that $P(t)f \in C_{\rm b}(E)$ for all $t > 0$ and $f \in C_{\rm b}(E)$, so $\mathscr{C} \subseteq \mathsf{D}(L)\cap C_{\rm b}(E)$. □

Let M_ε be the infinitesimal generator of P_ε on $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$.

Proposition 3.4 (cf. [9, Proposition 3.3])**.** *We have $\mathsf{D}(M_\varepsilon) = \mathsf{D}(L)$ and*

$$M_\varepsilon = L - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. Let us show that $\mathsf{D}(L) \subseteq \mathsf{D}(M_\varepsilon)$ and that the identity (3.10) holds on $\mathsf{D}(L)$. Then, since both M_ε and $L - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V$ are semigroup generators, the identity $\mathsf{D}(M_\varepsilon) = \mathsf{D}(L)$ follows.

Fix $f \in \mathsf{D}(L)\cap C_{\rm b}(E)$ and $x \in E$. For all $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}P_\varepsilon(t)f(x) - f(x) &= \mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t V(X^x(s))ds}] - f(x)\\ &= \mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))] - f(x) + \mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))(e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t V(X^x(s))ds} - 1)].\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Dividing both sides by t and letting $t \downarrow 0$, by pathwise continuity and dominated convergence we obtain

$$\frac{1}{t}(P_\varepsilon(t)f - f) \to Lf - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}Vf$$

in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. It follows that $f \in \mathsf{D}(M_\varepsilon)$ and $M_\varepsilon f = Lf - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}Vf$.

Let now $f \in \mathsf{D}(L)$ be arbitrary. Let $f_n \to f$ in $\mathsf{D}(L)$ with $f_n \in \mathscr{C}$, where $\mathscr{C}$ is as in Lemma 3.3. Then $f_n \to f$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$, $Lf_n \to Lf$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$, and $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}Vf_n \to \frac{1}{\varepsilon}Vf$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. Therefore $M_\varepsilon f_n = Lf_n - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}Vf_n \to Lf - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}Vf$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. Since M_ε is closed, this implies that $f \in \mathsf{D}(M_\varepsilon)$ and $M_\varepsilon f = Lf - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}Vf$. □

4. THE SEMIGROUP $P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)$

On $B_{\rm b}(\mathcal{O})$, following [8, 25] we define the operators $P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)$ for $t \geqslant 0$ by

$$P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f(x) := \mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}}>t\}}], \quad x \in \mathcal{O}.$$

Here,

$$\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}} := \inf\{t > 0 : \ X^x(t) \in \complement\mathcal{O}\}$$

is the entrance time of $\complement\mathcal{O}$ corresponding to the initial value x. As $\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}} > 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$ it is clear that $P_{\mathcal{O}}(0)f = f$, and an easy calculation based on (2.3) shows that $P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)P_{\mathcal{O}}(s)f = P_{\mathcal{O}}(t+s)f$ for all $t, s \geqslant 0$.

For $\varepsilon > 0$ let

$$\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon := \{x \in \mathcal{O} : \ d(x, \complement\mathcal{O}) > \varepsilon\}.$$

Let $V_\varepsilon : \mathbb{E} \to [0, 1]$ be the potential defined by

$$V_\varepsilon(x) = \tfrac{1}{\varepsilon} d(x, \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon) \wedge 1.$$

Note that $V_\varepsilon \equiv 0$ on $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_\varepsilon$ and $V_\varepsilon \equiv 1$ on $\complement\mathcal{O}$. In the results below, we denote by P_ε the strongly continous semigroup of contractions on $B_b(E)$ generated by $L - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V_\varepsilon$.

For functions $f \in B_{\rm b}(\mathcal{O})$ we define

$$\widetilde{f}(x) := \begin{cases} f(x), & x \in \mathcal{O}, \\ 0, & x \in \complement\mathcal{O}. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.1 (cf. [9, Proposition 3.5])**.** *For all $f \in B_{\rm b}(\mathcal{O})$, $x \in \mathcal{O}$, and $t \geqslant 0$,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} P_\varepsilon(t)\widetilde{f}(x) = P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f(x).$$

Proof. For $t = 0$ the result is trivial, so we may assume that $t > 0$. Fix $x \in \mathcal{O}$.

On the set $\{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}} > t\}$ we have $X^x(s) \in \mathcal{O}$ for all $s \in [0, t]$ and therefore $V_\varepsilon(X^x(s)) = 0$ for all $s \in [0, t]$ provided $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. If, on the other hand, $\omega \in \{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}} \leqslant t\}$, then by path continuity we have $X^x(t_0(\omega), \omega) \in \partial\mathcal{O}$ for some $t_0(\omega) \in (0, t]$, and therefore $V_\varepsilon(X^x(t_0(\omega), \omega)) = 1$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence for some small enough $\delta(\omega) > 0$ we have $V_\varepsilon(X^x(s, \omega)) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$ for all $s \in [t_0(\omega) - \delta(\omega), t_0(\omega)]$. Then

$$\int_0^t V_\varepsilon(X^x(s, \omega))\, ds \geqslant \int_{t_0(\omega)-\delta(\omega)}^{t_0(\omega)} V_\varepsilon(X^x(s, \omega))\, ds \geqslant \tfrac{1}{2}\delta(\omega) > 0,$$

and therefore $\limsup_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t V_\varepsilon(X^x(s,\omega))\, ds} \leqslant \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} e^{-\frac{\delta(\omega)}{2\varepsilon}} = 0$.

Using these facts, by dominated convergence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} P_\varepsilon(t)\widetilde{f}(x) &= \mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}}>t\}}] + \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \int_{\{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}}\leqslant t\}} \widetilde{f}(X^x(t))e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t V_\varepsilon(X^x(s))\, ds}\, d\mathbb{P} \\ &= P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f(x) + \lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} \int_{\{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}}\leqslant t\}} \widetilde{f}(X^x(t))e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t V_\varepsilon(X^x(s))\, ds}\, d\mathbb{P} \\ &= P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f(x). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 4.2. The papers [9] considers closed domains K are used instead of open sets $\mathcal{O}$. This has the advantage that one can work with one potential V which vanishes on K and is strictly positive outside K. In this setting, however, we don't see how to prove the analogue Proposition 4.1 without any assumptions on the boundary of K (the problem being the identity $P_K(0)f(x) = f(x)$ for points $x \in \partial K$, which in general need not hold).

Proposition 4.3. *The semigroup $P_{\mathcal{O}}$ has a unique extension to a C_0-semigroup of contractions on $L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$.*

Proof. First we prove that each of the operators $P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)$ extends uniquely to a contraction on $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for all $f \in B_{\rm b}(\mathcal{O})$ and $x \in \mathcal{O}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}(P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f(x))^2 &= (\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{f}(X^x(t))\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}}>t\}}])^2\\ &\leqslant \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{f}^2(X^x(t))\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}}>t\}}] \leqslant P(t)\widetilde{f}^2(x).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}}(P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f)^2\,d\mu_\infty \leqslant \int_E P(t)\widetilde{f}^2\,d\mu_\infty = \int_E \widetilde{f}^2\,d\mu_\infty = \int_{\mathcal{O}} f^2\,d\mu_\infty.$$

This proves the asserted contractivity.

To prove strong continuity on $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$, first let $f \in B_{\rm b}(\mathcal{O})$. Then, by the path continuity of X^x, for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$ we have $\lim_{t\downarrow 0} X^x(t) = x$ and $\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}} > 0$, and therefore

$$\lim_{t\downarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f(x) = \lim_{t\downarrow 0}\mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}}>t\}}] = f(x)$$

by dominated convergence. Again by dominated convergence, this implies that $\lim_{t\downarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f = f$ in $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$. For general $f \in L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$, strong continuity in $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ follows by density. □

From now on, $P_{\mathcal{O}}$ always denotes the C_0-semigroup of contractions on $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ whose existence is assured by the proposition. We denote by $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ its generator.

Proposition 4.4 (cf. [9, Proposition 3.7])**.** *For all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ and $t > 0$,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}(P_\varepsilon(t)\widetilde{f})|_{\mathcal{O}} = P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty). \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, for all $\lambda > 0$ with $\lambda \in \varrho(L - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V_\varepsilon)$ we have $\lambda \in \varrho(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}(R(\lambda, L - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V_\varepsilon)\widetilde{f})|_{\mathcal{O}} = R(\lambda, L_{\mathcal{O}})f \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty). \tag{4.2}$$

Here, for an operator A and $\lambda \in \varrho(A)$, $R(\lambda, A) := (\lambda - A)^{-1}$ denotes the associated resolvent operator.

Proof. First let $f \in C_{\rm b}(\mathcal{O})$. Then for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$ we have the pointwise bounds

$$|P_\varepsilon(t)\widetilde{f}(x)| = |\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{f}(X^x(t))e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t V_\varepsilon(X^x(s))\,ds}]| \leqslant \|f\|_\infty$$

and

$$|P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f(x)| = |\mathbb{E}[f(X^x(t))\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau^x_{\mathcal{O}}>t\}}]| \leqslant \|f\|_\infty.$$

Hence by Proposition 4.1 and dominated convergence theorem we obtain

$$\lim_{t\downarrow 0}\|(P_\varepsilon(t)\widetilde{f})|_{\mathcal{O}} - P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} = 0$$

for all $f \in C_{\rm b}(E)$. Since P_ε and $P_{\mathcal{O}}$ are contractive in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ and $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$, respectively, this convergence extends to arbitrary $f \in L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$.

Finally, (4.2) follows from (4.1) by taking Laplace transforms. □

Recalling the definition $W^{1,2}_H(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty) := \mathsf{D}(D^H)$, we now define

$$\mathring{W}^{1,2}_H(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty) := \big\{f \in L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty) :\ \widetilde{f} \in \mathsf{D}(D^H),\ D^H\widetilde{f} = 0\ \mu_\infty\text{-a.e. on } \complement\mathcal{O}\big\}.$$

Thus, $\mathring{W}^{1,2}_H(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ is the natural domain of the part of D^H in $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$. We shall study this operator in more detail in the next section.

Theorem 4.5 (cf. [9, Theorem 3.8])**.** *For all $\lambda > 0$ and $f \in L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ we have $\phi := R(\lambda, L_{\mathcal{O}})f \in \mathring{W}^{1,2}_H(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ and*

$$\lambda\int_{\mathcal{O}}\phi v\,d\mu_\infty + \int_{\mathcal{O}}[BD^H\phi, D^Hv]\,d\mu_\infty = \int_{\mathcal{O}} fv\,d\mu_\infty \quad \forall v \in \mathring{W}^{1,2}_H(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty). \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. Fix $\lambda > 0$ and $f \in L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ set

$$\phi_\varepsilon := R(\lambda, M_\varepsilon)\widetilde{f} = R(\lambda, L - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}V_\varepsilon)\widetilde{f}.$$

Then $\phi_\varepsilon \in \mathsf{D}(M_\varepsilon) = \mathsf{D}(L)$, so $\phi_\varepsilon \in \mathsf{D}(D^H) = W_H^{1,2}(E, \mu_\infty)$, and by (3.4) and (3.5) (applied to the potentials V_ε) we obtain

$$\|\phi_\varepsilon\|^2_{W_H^{1,2}(E,\mu_\infty)} = \|\phi_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)} + \|D^H\phi_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty;H)} \leqslant \big(\frac{1}{\lambda^2} + \frac{2}{\lambda}\big)\|f\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)}.$$

Therefore there exists a sequence $\varepsilon_j \to 0$ and a function $\psi \in W_H^{1,2}(E, \mu_\infty)$ such that $\phi_{\varepsilon_j} \to \psi$ weakly in $W_H^{1,2}(E, \mu_\infty)$ as $j \to \infty$. Let us prove that $\psi = \widetilde{\phi}$.

For every $g \in L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$, by (4.2) we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} \psi g \, d\mu_\infty = \lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{\mathcal{O}} \phi_{\varepsilon_j} g \, d\mu_\infty = \int_{\mathcal{O}} \phi g \, d\mu_\infty.$$

Thus $\psi|_{\mathcal{O}} = \phi$. Next we want to prove that $\psi|_{\complement\mathcal{O}} = 0$. The weak convergence $\phi_{\varepsilon_j} \to \psi$ in $W_H^{1,2}(E, \mu_\infty)$ implies weak convergence in $L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$, and therefore

$$\int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} \psi^2 V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty = \lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} \phi_{\varepsilon_j} \psi V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty.$$

Using (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned} \Big| \int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} \phi_{\varepsilon_j} \psi V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty \Big| &\leqslant \Big(\int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} |\phi_{\varepsilon_j}|^2 V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty \Big)^{1/2} \Big(\int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} |\psi|^2 V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty \Big)^{1/2} \\ &\leqslant \Big(\frac{\varepsilon_j}{\lambda} \int_E |\widetilde{f}|^2 \, d\mu_\infty \Big)^{1/2} \Big(\int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} |\psi|^2 V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty \Big)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Upon letting $j \to \infty$, we obtain that $\psi|_{\complement\mathcal{O}} = 0$ μ_∞-almost everywhere.

By what has been proved so far, $\phi_{\varepsilon_j} \to \widetilde{\phi}$ weakly in $W_H^{1,2}(E, \mu_\infty)$.

Next we will prove that $(D^H\widetilde{\phi})|_{\complement\mathcal{O}} = 0$ μ_∞-almost everywhere. By (3.5), the functions $D^H\phi_\varepsilon$ are uniformly bounded in $L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$, and therefore there exists a (possibly different) sequence $\varepsilon_j \to 0$ and a function $\xi \in W_H^{1,2}(E, \mu_\infty)$ such that $D^H\phi_{\varepsilon_j} \to \xi$ weakly in $L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$ as $j \to \infty$. Then,

$$\int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} \xi^2 V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty = \lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} D^H\phi_{\varepsilon_j} \xi V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty.$$

Using (3.7),

$$\begin{aligned} \Big| \int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} D^H\phi_{\varepsilon_j} \xi V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty \Big| &\leqslant \Big(\int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} \|D^H\phi_{\varepsilon_j}\|_H^2 V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty \Big)^{1/2} \Big(\int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} |\xi|^2 V_{\varepsilon_j} \, d\mu_\infty \Big)^{1/2} \\ &\leqslant \Big(\frac{\varepsilon_j^{1/2}}{\lambda^{1/2}} \int_E |\widetilde{f}|^2 \, d\mu_\infty \Big)^{1/2} \Big(\int_{\complement\mathcal{O}} |\xi|^2 \, d\mu_\infty \Big)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Upon letting $j \to \infty$, we obtain that $\xi|_{\complement\mathcal{O}} = 0$ μ_∞-almost everywhere. Moreover, the closedness (and hence, by the Hahn-Banach theorem, weak closedness) of D^H gives $D^H\widetilde{\phi} = \xi$. This proves that $(D^H\widetilde{\phi})|_{\complement\mathcal{O}} = 0$ μ_∞-almost everywhere.

Combining what we have proved so far, we see that $\phi \in \mathring{W}_H^{1,2}(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$. Next we multiply the identity $\lambda\phi_{\varepsilon_j} - L\phi_{\varepsilon_j} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_j}V_{\varepsilon_j}\phi_{\varepsilon_j} = \widetilde{f}$ with $\widetilde{v}$, where $v \in \mathring{W}_H^{1,2}(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$. Upon integrating over $E \setminus (\mathcal{O} \setminus \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon)$ and noting that $V_{\varepsilon_j}\widetilde{v} \equiv 0$ on this set, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{E\setminus(\mathcal{O}\setminus\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon)} (\lambda - L)\phi_{\varepsilon_j} \widetilde{v} \, d\mu_\infty \\ &\quad = \int_{E\setminus(\mathcal{O}\setminus\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon)} (\lambda - L)\phi_{\varepsilon_j} \widetilde{v} \, d\mu_\infty + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_j} \int_{E\setminus(\mathcal{O}\setminus\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon)} V_{\varepsilon_j} \phi_{\varepsilon_j} \widetilde{v} \, d\mu_\infty = \int_{E\setminus(\mathcal{O}\setminus\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon)} \widetilde{f}\widetilde{v} \, d\mu_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit for $j \to \infty$ and using Proposition 2.4, we obtain

$$\lambda \int_E \phi_{\varepsilon_j} \widetilde{v}\, d\mu_\infty + \int_E [BD^H \phi_{\varepsilon_j}, D^H \widetilde{v}]\, d\mu_\infty = \int_E (\lambda - L)\phi_{\varepsilon_j} \widetilde{v}\, d\mu_\infty = \int_E \widetilde{f}\widetilde{v}\, d\mu_\infty.$$

This proves (4.3). □

It follows from this theorem that $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}}) \subseteq \mathring{W}_H^{1,2}(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$. In particular, the space $\mathring{W}_H^{1,2}(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$ is dense in $L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$.

Consider the bilinear form (recall that we work over the real scalars)

$$(f, g) \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{O}} [BD^H f, D^H g]\, d\mu_\infty, \quad f, g \in \mathring{W}_H^{1,2}(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty).$$

It is an easy consequence of the identity $[Bh, h] = \frac{1}{2}\|h\|_H^2$ (see Proposition 2.3) that this form is densely defined, continuous, accretive, and closed. Arguing as in [20, Proposition 4.3] we see that it is in fact sectorial, and therefore we can define a closed densely defined operator $-M_{\mathcal{O}}$, which we will call the *Dirichlet Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator*, on $L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$ with this form in the usual way (see [24, Section 1.2.3]), and $M_{\mathcal{O}}$ generates a strongly continuous analytic contraction semigroup on $L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$.

Theorem 4.6. *We have $L_{\mathcal{O}} = M_{\mathcal{O}}$. As a consequence, the semigroup $P_{\mathcal{O}}$ is a strongly continuous analytic contraction semigroup on $L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$.*

Proof. Using the notation of the previous proposition, from (4.3) it follows that if $f \in L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$ and $\lambda > 0$, then $\phi = R(\lambda, L_{\mathcal{O}})f \in \mathsf{D}(M_{\mathcal{O}})$ and

$$\lambda\phi - M_{\mathcal{O}}\phi = f = \lambda\phi - L_{\mathcal{O}}\phi.$$

It follows that $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}}) \subseteq \mathsf{D}(M_{\mathcal{O}})$ and that $L_{\mathcal{O}} = M_{\mathcal{O}}$ on $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$. Since both operators are semigroup generators, this implies that $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}}) = \mathsf{D}(M_{\mathcal{O}})$ and $L_{\mathcal{O}} = M_{\mathcal{O}}$. □

We conclude this section with a gradient estimate for non-symmetric Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups. Da Prato and Lunardi studied the symmetric case (see [9, Section 3.3, consequence (iii), and Proposition 3.9]).

Theorem 4.7 (Gradient estimates)**.** *For all $f \in L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$*

$$\|D^H P_\varepsilon(t) f\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty;H)} \leqslant \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}} \|f\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)},$$

and for all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty)$

$$\|D^H P_{\mathcal{O}}(t) f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)} \leqslant \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)}.$$

Proof. Using (3.5) and setting $t = \frac{1}{\lambda}$ we observe that, for all $g \in L^2(E, \mu_\infty)$,

$$\|D^H (I - tL + \frac{t}{\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon)^{-1} g\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty;H)} \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{2}{t}} \|g\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)}.$$

Then using this estimate with the L^2-contractivity of $P_\varepsilon(t)$ and its L^2-analyticity we obtain

$$\|D^H P_\varepsilon(t) f\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty;H)} \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{2}{t}} \|(I - tL + \frac{t}{\varepsilon} V_\varepsilon) P_\varepsilon(t) f\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)} \leqslant \frac{C_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{t}} \|f\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)},$$

with a constant C_ε which, as an inspection of the proof shows, can be uniformly bounded from above independently of $\varepsilon > 0$. Applying the method of proof of the inequality (3.5) on the identity (4.3) yields

$$\|D^H R(\lambda, L_{\mathcal{O}}) f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)} \leqslant \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)}. \tag{4.4}$$

Then arguing as above we obtain

$$\|D^H P_{\mathcal{O}}(t) f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)} \leqslant \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)}.$$

□

5. Boundedness of the Riesz transform for $L_{\mathcal{O}}$

In this section we obtain sufficient conditions for the boundedness on $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ of the Riesz transform associated with $L_{\mathcal{O}}$. Observe that when $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ is selfadjoint (i.e. when $B = \frac{1}{2}I$), this follows from the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \|(-L_{\mathcal{O}})^{1/2} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} &= -\int_{\mathcal{O}} L_{\mathcal{O}} f \cdot f \, d\mu_\infty \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathcal{O}} [D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f, D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f] \, d\mu_\infty = \frac{1}{2} \|D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to discuss the non-selfadjoint case we need to introduce some auxiliary operators.

We begin by defining the operator $D^H_{\mathcal{O}}$ with domain $\mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}}) := \mathring{W}^{1,2}_H(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ by

$$D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f := D^H \widetilde{f}, \quad f \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}}).$$

By the definition of $\mathring{W}^{1,2}_H(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$, $D^H \widetilde{f}$ vanishes μ_∞-almost everywhere on $\complement\mathcal{O}$, so that it can indeed be identified with an element of $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)$.

Lemma 5.1. *The operator $D^H_{\mathcal{O}}$ is closed an densely defined in $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$.*

Proof. We have already seen that $\mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}}) = \mathring{W}^{1,2}_H(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ is dense in $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$. To see that $D^H_{\mathcal{O}}$ is closed, let $f_n \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})$ be such that $f_n \to f$ in $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ and $D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f_n \to g$ in $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)$. Then $\widetilde{f}_n \to \widetilde{f}$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$ and $D^H \widetilde{f}_n \to \widetilde{g}$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty;H)$, so $\widetilde{f} \in \mathsf{D}(D^H)$ and $D^H \widetilde{f} = \widetilde{g}$. But this is the same as saying that $f \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})$ and $D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f = g$. □

Thanks to this lemma, the adjoint operator $D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} = (D^H_{\mathcal{O}})^*$ is well-defined as a closed densely defined operator on $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)$.

The next lemma is a straightforward consequence of the definition of $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ in terms of the bilinear form $l_{\mathcal{O}}$.

Lemma 5.2. *We have*

$$\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}}) = \{f \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}}) : BD^H_{\mathcal{O}} f \in \mathsf{D}(D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}})\} = \{f \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}}) : D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f \in \mathsf{D}(D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}} B)\},$$

and for all $f \in \mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ we have

$$L_{\mathcal{O}} f = -D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} (BD^H_{\mathcal{O}}) f = (D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}} B) D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f.$$

Consider the form

$$\underline{l}^I_{\mathcal{O}}(F,G) := \int_{\mathcal{O}} [D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} F, D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} G]_H \, d\mu_\infty$$

for $F, G \in \mathsf{D}(\underline{l}^I_{\mathcal{O}}) := \mathsf{D}(D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}})$. This form is accretive, densely defined and closed, and since it is symmetric, it is sectorial. Therefore the associated operator, which we denote by $D^H_{\mathcal{O}} D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}}$, is densely defined, closed, and selfadjoint, with domain

$$\mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}} D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}}) = \{F \in \mathsf{D}(D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}}) : \ D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} F \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})\}.$$

Since B is bounded and coercive we have equivalences of norms

$$\|Bu\| \eqsim \|u\| \eqsim \|B^* u\|.$$

As a consequence, B is boundedly invertible. By the argument of [20, Proposition 5.1]), it follows from [2, Proposition 7.1] that the operator

$$\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}} := -D^H_{\mathcal{O}} D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} B$$

with domain

$$\mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}} D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} B) = \{F \in L^2(\mathcal{O}; H) : \ BF \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}} D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}})\}$$

is closed, densely defined, and sectorial. In particular, $\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$ generates a bounded analytic semigroup, denoted by $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{O}}(t)$, on $L^2(\mathcal{O}, \mu_\infty; H)$ (see [14, Theorem 4.6]).

Lemma 5.3. *For all $g \in \mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ and $t > 0$ we have $(I - tL_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} g \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})$ and*

$$D^H_{\mathcal{O}}(I - tL_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} g = (I - t\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} D^H_{\mathcal{O}} g \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$(I - tL_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} B D^H_{\mathcal{O}} g = D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} B (I - t\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} D^H_{\mathcal{O}} g. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. The set $\mathscr{A} := \{f \in \mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}}) : \ L_{\mathcal{O}} f \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})\}$ is dense (it contains the dense set $\mathscr{B} = \{R(\lambda, L_{\mathcal{O}})g : \ \lambda > 0, \ g \in \mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})\}$) and invariant under $P_{\mathcal{O}}(t)$, and therefore it is a core for $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$.

For all $f \in \mathscr{A}$ we have, using Lemma 5.2 to justify the formal computation,

$$D^H_{\mathcal{O}} L_{\mathcal{O}} f = -D^H_{\mathcal{O}} D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} B D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f = \underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}} D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f.$$

Multiplying the resulting identity

$$D^H_{\mathcal{O}}(I - tL_{\mathcal{O}}) f = (I - t\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}) D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f$$

on the left by $(I - t\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1}$ and taking $f = (I - tL_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} g$ with $g \in \mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ (in which case we have $f \in \mathscr{A}$), the identity in (5.1) is obtained for functions $g \in \mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$.

Next, $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ is a core for $\mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})$ and by (5.1), for all $f \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f, B(I - t\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} D^H_{\mathcal{O}} g] &= [D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f, B D^H_{\mathcal{O}} (I - tL_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} g] \\
&= -[f, L_{\mathcal{O}}(I - tL_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} g] = -[f, (I - tL_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} L_{\mathcal{O}} g] \\
&= [f, (I - tL_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} B D^H_{\mathcal{O}} g].
\end{aligned}$$

This show that $B(I - t\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} D^H_{\mathcal{O}} g$ is in $\mathsf{D}(D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}})$ and (5.2) holds. □

By standard semigroup theory, the above lemma implies the identity

$$\underline{P}_{\mathcal{O}}(t) D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f = D^H_{\mathcal{O}} P_{\mathcal{O}}(t) f,$$

first for $f \in \mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ and then for $f \in \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})$, using that $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ is a core for $\mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})$. In particular, we see that the semigroup $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{O}}$ maps $\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$ into itself. From now on, we shall always consider $\underline{P}_{\mathcal{O}}$ as a semigroup on this space. By a slight abuse of notation its generator, which is the part of $\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$ in $\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$, will be denoted again by $\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$.

On the product space $L^2(E, \mu_\infty) \oplus \overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$ we now consider the operator

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{O}} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} B \\ D^H_{\mathcal{O}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with domain $\mathsf{D}(\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}) = \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}}) \oplus \mathsf{D}(D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}} B)$, where, by the same abuse of notation, we denote by $\mathsf{D}^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} B$ the domain of the part of $D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}} B$ in $\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$. Observe that

$$\Pi^2_{\mathcal{O}} := \begin{pmatrix} -L_{\mathcal{O}} & 0 \\ 0 & -\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

A densely defined closed linear operator A is called *bisectorial* if $i\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \varrho(A)$ and

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus 0} \|(I - itA)^{-1}\| < \infty.$$

A standard Taylor expansion argument implies that there exists an $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}\pi)$ such that the open bisector of angle θ around the imaginary axis belongs to $\varrho(A)$ and the above uniform boundedness estimate extends to this bisector.

Let us recall the following result (see [1, Section (H)]).

Proposition 5.4. *If* Π *is a bisectorial operator on a Hilbert space* $\mathscr{H}$*, then* Π^2 *is sectorial on* $\mathscr{H}$ *and for each* $\theta \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ *the following assertions are equivalent:*

(1) Π *admits a bounded functional calculus on a bisector of angle* θ*;*
(2) Π^2 *admits a bounded functional calculus on a sector of angle* 2θ*.*

The main result of this section reads as follows. Examples where the conditions of the theorem are fulfilled are given subsequently.

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose that* $-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$ *admits a bounded holomorphic functional calculus on* $\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$*. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}}) &= \mathsf{D}((-L_{\mathcal{O}})^{1/2}), \\ \mathsf{D}(D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}} B) &= \mathsf{D}((-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}})^{1/2}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

with equivalence of the homogeneous seminorms

$$\begin{aligned} \|D^H_{\mathcal{O}} f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)} &\eqsim \|(-L_{\mathcal{O}})^{1/2} f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)}, \\ \|D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}} B g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} &\eqsim \|(-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}})^{1/2} g\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Furthermore, we have the domain inclusion

$$\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}}) \subseteq \mathsf{D}((D^H_{\mathcal{O}})^2). \tag{5.5}$$

Here, $(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})^2$ is the closed and densely defined operator from $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ to $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty; H\otimes H)$ (with $H\otimes H$ the Hilbert space tensor product of H with itself) defined in the obvious way.

Proof. We shall prove that $\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}$ is bisectorial on $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)\oplus\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$. Assuming this for the moment, we first show how the result follows from this.

Since $-L_{\mathcal{O}}$ and $-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$ have bounded functional calculi on suitable sectors of angle $< \frac{1}{2}\pi$ (for $-L_{\mathcal{O}}$ this follows from the fact that $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ generates an analytic contraction semigroup), the same is true for $\Pi^2_{\mathcal{O}}$ and hence, by Proposition 5.4, $\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}$ has a bounded functional calculus on a bisector of angle $< \frac{1}{4}\pi$. This implies the boundedness of the operators $\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}/\sqrt{\Pi^2_{\mathcal{O}}}$ and of $\sqrt{\Pi^2_{\mathcal{O}}}/\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}$ (apply the functional calculus of $\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}$ to the the bounded holomorphic functions $z/\sqrt{z^2}$ and $\sqrt{z^2}/z$). By a standard argument, this implies (5.3) and (5.4); we refer to [3, 20] for the details.

It remains to prove the bisectoriality of $\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}$. Fix $t\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$ and consider the operator matrix

$$R_t := \begin{pmatrix} (I-t^2L_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} & it(I-t^2L_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1}D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}}B \\ itD^H_{\mathcal{O}}(I-t^2L_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} & (I-t^2\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

By Lemma 5.3, the identity $R_t(I-it\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}) = I$ holds on the linear subspace of all $(g,G)\in L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)\oplus\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$ with $g\in\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ and $G = D^H_{\mathcal{O}}g'$ with $g'\in\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$. Since $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ is a core for $\mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})$, this linear subspace is dense and the identity extends to all pairs $(g,G)\in L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)\oplus\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$.

This shows that R_t equals the resolvent $(I-it\Pi_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1}$ defined on $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)\oplus\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$. Let us now study the boundedness of each of the entries of the matrix R_t.

We have already seen that

$$\|(I-t^2L_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} \leqslant 1 \quad\text{and}\quad \|(I-t^2\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)} \leqslant C,$$

with a constant C independent of $t\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$.

Taking $\lambda = \frac{1}{t^2}$ in (4.4) we obtain

$$\|tD^H_{\mathcal{O}}(I - t^2 L_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)} \leqslant 2. \tag{5.6}$$

The previous argument hold also if we replace B by B^* in the definition of $L_{\mathcal{O}}$, so we obtain (5.6) with $L^*_{\mathcal{O}}$ instead of $L_{\mathcal{O}}$. Then, using Lemma 5.2 to see that $L_{\mathcal{O}} = (D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}} B)D^H_{\mathcal{O}}$ implies $L^*_{\mathcal{O}} = D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}}(D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}}B)^* = D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}}(B^* D^H_{\mathcal{O}}) = (D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}}B^*)D^H_{\mathcal{O}}$, and using (5.6) with $L^*_{\mathcal{O}}$ instead of $L_{\mathcal{O}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|tB^* D^H_{\mathcal{O}}(I - t^2 L^*_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)} &\leqslant \|B\| \|tD^H_{\mathcal{O}}(I - t^2 L^*_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)} \\ &\leqslant 2\|B\| \leqslant 1,\end{aligned}$$

and by duality we obtain

$$\|t(I - t^2 L_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1} D^{H^*}_{\mathcal{O}} B\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} \leqslant 1.$$

As a consequence, the operators $(I - it\Pi_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1}$ are uniformly bounded on the space $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty) \oplus \overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$. By standard arguments, this implies that $\Pi_{\mathcal{O}}$ is bisectorial on $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty) \oplus \overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$.

To prove the domain inclusion (5.5), let $\underline{D}^H_{\mathcal{O}} = D^H_{\mathcal{O}} \otimes I$ as a closed and densely defined operator from $\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$ to $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty; H \otimes H)$. Using the identity (5.1), the argument of [20, Proposition 11.1(iii)] can be adapted to show that $\mathsf{D}(\sqrt{-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}}) \subseteq \mathsf{D}(\underline{D}^H_{\mathcal{O}})$.

Now, following the lines of the proof of [20, Theorem 2.2] and using (5.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\| + \|L_{\mathcal{O}}f\| &\eqsim \|f\| + \|D^H_{\mathcal{O}}f\| + \|L_{\mathcal{O}}f\| \\ &= \|f\| + \|D^H_{\mathcal{O}}f\| + \|(D^{H*}_{\mathcal{O}}B)D^H_{\mathcal{O}}f\| \\ &\eqsim \|f\| + \|D^H_{\mathcal{O}}f\| + \|\sqrt{-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}}D^H_{\mathcal{O}}f\| \\ &\gtrsim \|f\| + \|D^H_{\mathcal{O}}f\| + \|\underline{D}^H_{\mathcal{O}}D^H_{\mathcal{O}}f\| \\ &= \|f\| + \|D^H_{\mathcal{O}}f\| + \|(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})^2 f\|.\end{aligned}$$

□

The condition that $-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$ has a functional calculus is satisfied when $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ is selfadjoint. Indeed, then $\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$ is selfadjoint as well and $-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$, being non-negative and selfadjoint, admits a bounded holomorphic calculus.

Open problem. If $-\underline{L}$ admits a bounded holomorphic calculus on $\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H)}$, does $-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$ admit a bounded holomorphic calculus on $\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$?

An affirmative answer would imply that the condition of Theorem 5.5 is always satisfied in case $H = E = \mathbb{R}^n$ (as is explained in the discussion below [20, Theorem 2.2]).

We conclude with a Poincaré inequality for $L_{\mathcal{O}}$.

Theorem 5.6 (Poincaré inequality for $L_{\mathcal{O}}$)**.** *Suppose that $\mu_\infty(\complement\mathcal{O}) > 0$ and that S_∞ is uniformly exponentially stable. If $-\underline{L}_{\mathcal{O}}$ admits a bounded holomorphic functional calculus on $\overline{\mathsf{R}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})}$, there is a constant C such that for all $u \in \mathring{W}^{1,2}(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ we have*

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} \leqslant C\|D^H_{\mathcal{O}}u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)}.$$

Proof. The proof is a modification of [9, Proposition 3.9].

Step 1 – In this step we prove that $0 \in \varrho(L_{\mathcal{O}})$.

Since $P_{\mathcal{O}}$ is a contraction semigroup on $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)$ (see Proposition 4.3), the spectrum of $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ is contained in the closed left-half plane. Therefore if $0 \in \sigma(L_{\mathcal{O}})$, it belongs to the approximate point spectrum of $L_{\mathcal{O}}$. This means that there is a sequence $(u_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ in $\mathsf{D}(L_{\mathcal{O}})$ such that $\|u_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} = 1$ for all $n \geqslant 1$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} L_{\mathcal{O}} u_n = 0$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. Then,

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} ||D^H_{\mathcal{O}} u_n||_H^2 \, d\mu_\infty = 2\int_{\mathcal{O}} [BD^H_{\mathcal{O}} u_n, D^H_{\mathcal{O}} u_n] \, d\mu_\infty = -2[L_{\mathcal{O}} u_n, u_n] \to 0.$$

Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} D^H \widetilde{u}_n = 0$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. Therefore, by Theorem 2.8, $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\widetilde{u}_n - \overline{\widetilde{u}_n}) = 0$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. But then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\overline{\widetilde{u}_n}\|_{L^2(E,\mu_\infty)} = 1$, which means that $\overline{\widetilde{u}_n} \to 1$ in $L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$. Passing to a subsequence, we may also assume that the convergence holds μ_∞-almost everywhere. But this contradicts the fact that $\widetilde{u}_n$ vanishes on the set $\complement\mathcal{O}$ which has positive μ_∞-measure by assumption.

Step 2 – By Step 1, $L_{\mathcal{O}}$ is boundedly invertible, and then $(-L_{\mathcal{O}})^{1/2}$ is boundedly invertible as well. Consequently, for $u \in \mathring{W}^{1,2}(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty) = \mathsf{D}((-L_{\mathcal{O}})^{1/2}) = \mathsf{D}(D^H_{\mathcal{O}})$ we have, by the equivalence of seminorms of Theorem 5.5,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} &\leqslant \|(-L_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1/2}\|\|(-L_{\mathcal{O}})^{1/2}u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} \\ &\eqsim \|(-L_{\mathcal{O}})^{-1/2}\|\|D^H_{\mathcal{O}} u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Note that if $\mu_\infty(\complement\mathcal{O}) = 0$, then we have a canonical identification $L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty) = L^2(E,\mu_\infty)$, and under this identification we have $\mathsf{D}^H_{\mathcal{O}} = D^H$ and $L_{\mathcal{O}} = L$. Then it follows from Theorem 2.8 that

$$\|u - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty)} \leqslant C\|D^H_{\mathcal{O}} u\|_{L^2(\mathcal{O},\mu_\infty;H)}.$$

Remark 5.7. Step 1 in the above proof could be simplified (along the lines of [9]) if we knew that L has compact resolvent.

References

[1] D. Albrecht, X.T. Duong, and A. McIntosh, Operator theory and harmonic analysis, in: "Instructional Workshop on Analysis and Geometry, Part III" (Canberra, 1995), Proc. Centre Math. Appl. Austral. Nat. Univ., vol. 34, Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra, 1996, pp. 77–136.

[2] P. Auscher, A. McIntosh, A. Nahmod, Holomorphic functional calculi of perturbed operators, quadratic estimates and interpolation, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **46**, (1997), no. 2, 375–403.

[3] A. Axelsson, S. Keith, A. McIntosh, Quadratic estimates and functional calculi of perturbed Dirac operators, *Invent. Math.* **163** (2006), no. 3, 455–497.

[4] R. Carmona, Tensor product of Gaussian measures, in: "Vector Space Measures and Applications" (Dublin, 1977), II, Lecture Notes in Phys., Vol. 77, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1978, pp. 96–124.

[5] A. Chojnowska-Michalik and B. Gołdys, Nonsymmetric Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup as second quantized operator, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **36**, (1996), no. 3, 481–498.

[6] A. Chojnowska-Michalik and B. Gołdys, Nonsymmetric Ornstein-Uhlenbeck generators, in: "Infinite Dimensional Stochastic Analysis" (Amsterdam, 1999), Royal. Neth. Acad. Arts Sci., Amsterdam, 2000, pp. 99–116.

[7] M.G. Cowling, Harmonic analysis on semigroups, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **117**, (1983), no. 2, 267–283.

[8] G. Da Prato, B. Gołdys, J. Zabczyk, Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups in open sets of Hilbert spaces, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **325** (1997), no. 4, 433–438.

[9] G. Da Prato and A. Lunardi, On the Dirichlet semigroup for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators in subsets of Hilbert spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* **259** (2010), no. 10, 2642–2672.

[10] G. Da Prato and A. Lunardi, Maximal L^2 regularity for Dirichlet problems in Hilbert spaces, arXiv:1201.3809.

[11] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, "Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions", Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[12] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk, "Second Order Partial Differential Equations in Hilbert Spaces", London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Vol. 293, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[13] J.-D. Deuschel and D.W. Stroock, "Large Deviations", Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 137, Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1989.

[14] K.J. Engel, R. Nagel, "A Short Course on Operator Semigroups", Universitext, Springer Verlag, New York, 2006.

[15] X. Fernique, Fonctions aléatoires à valeurs vectorielles, in: "Probability in Banach Spaces 6" (Sandbjerg, 1986), Progr. Probab., Vol. 20, Birkhäuser Verlag, Boston, MA, 1990, pp. 51–81.

[16] B. Goldys, F. Gozzi and J.M.A.M van Neerven, On closability of directional gradients, *Potential Anal.* **18** (2003), no. 4, 289–310.

[17] B. Goldys and J.M.A.M. van Neerven, Transition semigroups of Banach space valued Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes, *Acta Applicandae Math.* **76** (2003), 283–330.

[18] T. Kato, Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators, 2nd edition, Springer-Verlag, 1980.

[19] J. Maas and J.M.A.M. van Neerven, On analytic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups in infinite dimensions, *Arch. Math.* **89** (2007), 226–236.

[20] J. Maas and J.M.A.M. van Neerven, Boundedness of Riesz transforms for elliptic operators on abstract Wiener spaces, *J. Func. Anal.* **257** (2009), 2410–2475.

[21] J. Maas and J.M.A.M. van Neerven, Gradient estimates and domain identification for analytic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operators, in: "Parabolic Problems: The Herbert Amann Festschrift", Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications, Vol. 80, Birkhäuser Verlag, 2011, pp. 463–477.

[22] J.M.A.M. van Neerven, Nonsymmetric Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroups in Banach spaces, *J. Funct. Anal.* **155** (1998), 495–535.

[23] J.M.A.M. van Neerven and L. Weis, Stochastic integration of functions with values in a Banach space, *Studia Math.* **166** (2005), 131–170.

[24] E.M. Ouhabaz, "Analysis of Heat Equations on Domains", London Math. Soc. Monogr. Ser. 31, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2005.

[25] A. Talarczyk, Dirichlet problem for parabolic equations on Hilbert spaces, *Studia Math.* **141** (2000), no. 2, 109–142.

Notre Dame University - Louaize, Faculty of Natural and Applied Sciences, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, P.O. Box 72, Zouk Mikael, Zouk Mosbeh, Lebanon
E-mail address: `joyce.assaad@ndu.edu.lb`

Delft Institute of Applied Mathematics, Delft University of Technology, P.O. Box 5031, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands
E-mail address: `J.M.A.M.vanNeerven@TUDelft.nl`